

Application No.: 09/823,940

Docket No.: 102374-0015

**REMARKS**

This reply is in response to the Final Office Action date March 18, 2005. The amendments above and remarks that follow address the points raised in the Office Action and thereby place this application in condition for allowance.

**Claim Objections**

Claim 1 stands objected to due to informalities. The informality of "the the" has been amended to overcome this objection.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 24, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. These claims are amended to overcome this rejection.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 32 and 37-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dodrill et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,490,564.

Claim 32 is amended to add the feature of claim 39. Amended independent claim 32 is directed to a telecommunications system comprising a call control module that controls a call processing context associated with a subscriber. The system further comprises a call feature module in communication with the call control module. The call feature module accesses a compiled representation of textual description in a mark-up language of logic defining a call service provided to a subscriber in response to an event to effect execution of the service. The call feature module instantiates a feature context object that accesses the compiled representation to determine at least an action to be effected for providing the call service.

Dodrill fails to teach or suggest the use of a compiled representation of a call feature or service that is described, textually, by a markup language. Instead, Dodrill utilized markup language descriptions, namely XML. There is no suggestion that the XML should be compiled.

Application No.: 09/823,940

Docket No.: 102374-0015

Further, Dodrill does not teach that a object can access the compiled representation. This is in contrast to the feature context object of claim 32, which can access the compiled representation to determine an action to be effected for providing a call service.

In addition, Dodrill does not teach or suggest the feature context object of claim 32, as agreed upon during the interview of June 29, 2004.

Therefore, for the reasons above, among others, Dodrill fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 32. Claims 37-40 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 32 and, likewise, are patentable over the reference.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

**Claims 33-36**

Claims 33-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodrill in view of Danne et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,226,286.

Claims 33-36 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 32, and hence incorporate the features of claim 32. As discussed above, Dodrill fails to teach salient features of claim 32, and consequently, those of claim 33-36.

Danne fails to remedy the deficiencies of Dodrill, specifically that Danne does not teach or suggest the use of a compiled representation of a call feature of service that is described, textually, by a markup language. Further, Danne does not teach the feature context object as in claim 32 of the application.

Therefore, the combination of Dodrill and Danne do not render claim 33-36 unpatentable.

**Claims 1, 24, 25, and 28**

Claims 1, 24, 25, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bastep, U.S. Patent No. 6,731,625 in view of Smith, U.S. Patent No. 6,772,139 and Giordano, U.S. Patent No. 6,370,141.

Application No.: 09/823,940

Docket No.: 102374-0015

Claim 1 is directed to a method for providing telecommunications services. A compiled representation of a textual description in a mark-up language of operations for performing a call feature or service is generated. A feature object embodying the compiled representation is instantiated. A context object is instantiated that maintains information regarding a present state of the call feature or service, and that signals the feature object in regard to events occurring with respect to the call feature or service. The feature object responds to such signaling by effecting execution of one or more of the operations in the compiled representation of the textual description in the mark-up language.

Claim 24 is directed to method for providing telecommunications services. A textual description is provided in a mark-up language of a set of logic instructions describing a call service. The textual description is parsed to generate a compiled representation of the logic instructions. A feature object is instantiated embodying the compiled representation. A context object is instantiated in response to an event. The context object maintains information regarding a present state of the call service, and signals the feature object to access the compiled representation and to effect execution of the call service defined by the logic instructions.

Eastep does not appear to teach the subject matter of the claimed invention. The passages from Eastep cited by the Examiner are sections of the table of contents of the patent. Neither the cited table of content passages, nor their corresponding sections in the reference appear to teach the method of the claims.

For example, the Examiner cites column 11, lines 3-65, and states that this passages teaches "instantiating a feature object embodying the compiled representation" as in claim 1. Column 11, lines 3-65 is shown below:

Application No.: 09/823,940

Docket No.: 102374-0015

Video Operator Software System	
Class Hierarchy	5
Class and Object details	
Graphical User Interface Classes	
Class Hierarchy	
Class and Object details	
Video Operator Shared Database	10
Database Schema	
Video Operator Console Graphical User Interface Win-	
dows	
Main Console Window	
Schedule Window	15
Conference Window	
Video Watch Window	
Console Output Window	
Properties Dialog Box	
World Wide Web (WWW) Browser Capabilities	20
User Interface	
Performance	
Personal Home Page	
Storage Requirements	25
On Screen Help Text	
Personal Home Page Directory	
Control Bar	
Home Page	
Security Requirements	30
On Screen Help Text	
Profile Management	
Information Services Profile Management	
Personal Home Page Profile Management	
List Management	35
Global Message Handling	
Message Center	
Storage Requirements	
PC Client Capabilities	
User Interface	40
Security	
Message Retrieval	
Message Manipulation	
Order Entry Requirements	45
Provisioning and Fulfillment	
Traffic Systems	
Pricing	
Billing	
Directline MCI	50
Overview	
The ARU (Audio Response Unit) 502	
The VFP (Voice Fax Platform) 504	
The DDS (Data Distribution Service) 505	
Rationale	55
Detail	
Call Flow Architecture 520	
Network Connectivity	
Call Flow	
Data Flow Architecture	60
Voice Fax Platform (VFP) 504 Detailed Architecture	
Overview	
Rationale	
Detail	
Voice Distribution Detailed Architecture	65

Neither column 11, lines 3-65, nor the passages of the patent that correspond to this section of the table of contents, appears to teach "instantiating a feature object embodying the compiled representation".

Therefore, for the reasons above, among others, Eastep fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of claims 1 and 24.

Application No.: 09/823,940

Docket No.: 102374-0015

Smith and Giordano do not remedy the deficiencies of Eastep. Smith purports to teach a method of using hypertext links on the internet, while Giordano purports to teach a method for configuring an internet appliance by accessing a web site containing configuration information. Neither Smith nor Giordano teaches or suggest a method for providing telecommunications services as recited in the claims of the application.

Hence, for the reasons stated above, claims 1, 24, 25 and 28 are patentable over the combined references of Eastep, Smith, and Giordano.

Claim 2

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eastep, Smith, and Giordano in view of Cooper et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,646,947.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and hence incorporates the features of claim 1. As discussed above, the combination of Eastep, Smith, and Giordano fails to teach salient features of claim 1, and consequently, those of claim 2.

Cooper does not remedy the deficiencies of Eastep, Smith, and Giordano. Cooper purports to teach a method of frame synchronization in a superframe lock subsystem. Nowhere does Cooper teach or suggest a method for providing telecommunications services as recited in the claims.

Claim 3

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eastep, Smith, Giordano, and Cooper in view of Chiu, U.S. Patent No. 6,597,689.

Claim 3 depends from claim 2, which depends from claim 1, and hence incorporates the features of claims 1 and 2. As discussed above, the combination of Eastep, Smith, Giordano, and Cooper fails to teach salient features of claims 1 and 2, and consequently, those of claim 3.

Chiu does not remedy the deficiencies of Eastep, Smith, Giordano, and Cooper. Chiu purports to teach an intelligent multiservice access system that has the ability to utilize switched

Application No.: 09/823,940

Docket No.: 102374-0015

virtual connections for all communication lines coupled to the inputs and outputs. Nowhere does Chiu teach or suggest a method for providing telecommunications services as recited in the claims.

Claim 4

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eastep, Smith, and Giordano in view of Ram, U.S. Patent No. 5,991,389.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1, and hence incorporates the features of claim 1. As discussed above, the combination of Eastep, Smith, and Giordano fails to teach salient features of claim 1, and consequently, those of claim 4.

Ram does not remedy the deficiencies of Eastep, Smith, and Giordano. Ram does not teach or suggest a method for providing telecommunications services as recited in the claims of the invention.

Claims 5-7

Claims 5, 6, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eastep, Smith, Giordano, and Ram in view of Cooper.

Claims 5, 6, and 7 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and hence incorporate the features of claim 1. As discussed above, the combination of Eastep, Smith, Giordano, Ram, and Cooper fails to teach salient features of claim 1, and consequently, those of claims 5, 6, and 7.

Claims 8 and 9

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eastep, Smith, Giordano, Ram, and Cooper in view of LaPier, U.S. Patent No. 6,333,931.

Application No.: 09/823,940

Docket No.: 102374-0015

Claims 8 and 9 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and hence incorporate the features of claim 1. As discussed above, the combination of Eastep, Smith, Giordano, Ram, and Cooper fails to teach salient features of claim 1, and consequently, those of claim 8 and 9.

LaPier fails to remedy the deficiencies of the references. LaPier purports to teach a method of connecting a circuit-switched telephone network and a packet-switched data network to allow communication between them. LaPier does not teach or suggest a method for providing telecommunications services as recited in the claims of the invention.

Claims 10 and 11

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eastep, Smith, and Giordano in view of Truchon, U.S. Patent No. 6,144,723.

Claims 10 and 11 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and hence incorporate the features of claim 1. As discussed above, the combination of Eastep, Smith, and Giordano fails to teach salient features of claim 1, and consequently, those of claims 10 and 11.

Truchon fails to remedy the deficiencies of the references. Truchon purports to teach a method of connecting a circuit-switched telephone network and a packet-switched data network to allow communication between them. Truchon does not teach or suggest a method for providing telecommunications services as recited in the claims of the invention.

Claims 26 and 27

Claims 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eastep, Smith, and Giordano, in view of Gulliford, U.S. Patent No. 5,995,831.

Claims 26 and 27 depend from claim 24, and hence incorporate the features of claim 24. As discussed above, the combination of Eastep, Smith, and Giordano fails to teach salient features of claim 24, and consequently, those of claims 26 and 27.

Application No.: 09/823,940

Docket No.: 102374-0015

Gulliford fails to remedy the deficiencies of the combined references. Nowhere does Gulliford teach or suggest a method for providing telecommunications services as recited in the claims of the invention.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

David J. Powsner

Registration No.: 31,868

NUTTER MCCLENNEN &amp; FISH LLP

World Trade Center West

155 Seaport Boulevard

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2604

(617) 439-2000

(617) 310-9000 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant

1440421.1